

REMARKS

Claims 11-17 are amended. New Claims 18 and 19 are added. Claims 1-19 are pending. No new matter is added as a result of the claim amendments. Support for the claim amendments can be found at least on page 8, line 1, and page 10, lines 7-23, of the instant application.

103 Rejections

Claims 1-8 and 10-17

According to the instant Office Action, claims 1-8 and 10-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Carobolante (US 6,084,378) in view of Alfrey (US 2003/103364). Applicants have reviewed the Carobolante and Alfrey references, and respectfully submit that the embodiments of the present invention set forth in claims 1-8 and 10-17 are neither anticipated nor rendered obvious by Carobolante in view of Alfrey.

A shortcoming of this combination is that the primary reference Carobolante does not teach or suggest each of the limitations of independent claims 1, 4, 7 and 11, and the secondary reference Alfrey fails to teach or suggest a modification of Carobolante that would remedy the deficiencies of Carobolante.

In particular, Applicants respectfully submit that Carobolante in view of Alfrey does not teach or suggest "a switchover point between said linear current source and said PWM signal is selected to achieve a specified ripple current at said load" as set forth in independent claim 1. At column 14, lines 26-28, Carobolante states that the conditions under which a linear current source or a PWM current is used are a matter of design choice. However, there is no showing or suggestion in Carobolante that the condition at which the switchover

between the linear current source and the PWM signal occurs is selected in order to achieve a specified ripple current. In other words, the specific condition recited in claim 1 is not shown or suggested by Carobolante. Applicants respectfully submit that the conditions in Carobolante can be interpreted as including the claimed condition only in hindsight in light of the claimed limitations. Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner's conclusion of obviousness is based on a strained interpretation of the prior art reference, and that such an interpretation could be made only by impermissible hindsight gleaned from the Applicants' own disclosure.

In light of the above remarks, Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner taking Official Notice without citing a prior art reference, with regard to the finding that power supply systems have been known to be controlled to produce a specified ripple current at a load and the finding that Carobolante teaches that the method of supplying power is merely design choice. Therefore, Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's assertion that it also would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to control the system of Carobolante to produce a specified ripple current at the load, which is asserted relying on these Official Notices. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner provide a reference that teaches the limitations of the claims if this rejection is to be maintained.

Independent claims 4, 7 and 11 contain limitations similar to those contained in claim 1. Thus, by similar rationale, Applicants respectfully submit that Carobolante in view of Alfrey does not teach or suggest "a switchover point between said first and second modes is selected to achieve a specified ripple current at said load" as set forth in independent claims 4 and 11. Also, Carobolante in view of Alfrey does not teach or suggest "a switch over point

between said linear mode and second PWM mode is selected to achieve a specified ripple current at said load” as set forth in independent claim 7. Claims 2, 3 and 17 depend from claim 1 and set forth additional limitations of the embodiments of the claimed invention. Claims 5 and 6 depend from claim 4 and set forth additional limitations of the embodiments of the claimed invention. Claims 8 and 10 depend from claim 7 and set forth additional limitations of the embodiments of the claimed invention. Claims 12-16 depend from claim 11 and set forth additional limitations of the embodiments of the claimed invention.

Consequently, Applicants respectfully submit that the embodiments of the claimed invention set forth in claims 1-8 and 10-17 are not taught or anticipated by Carobolante in view of Alfrey. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that the basis for rejecting claims 1-8 and 10-17 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is traversed.

Claim 9

According to the Office Action, claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Carobolante in view of Alfrey, further in view of Walter (US 2003/0155813). Applicants have reviewed the Carobolante, Alfrey, and Walter references, and respectfully submit that the embodiments of the claimed invention set forth in claim 9 are neither anticipated nor rendered obvious by Carobolante in view of Alfrey, further in view of Walter.

As presented above, the primary reference Carobolante and the secondary reference Alfrey fail to teach or suggest each limitation of independent claim 7, from which claim 9 depends. Furthermore, the third reference Walter fails to teach or suggest a modification of Carobolante and Alfrey that would remedy the deficiencies of Carobolante and Alfrey.

Consequently, Applicants respectfully submit that the embodiments of the claimed invention set forth in claim 9 are not taught or anticipated by Carobolante in view of Alfrey, further in view of Walter. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that the basis for rejecting claim 9 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is traversed.


Conclusions

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, the Applicants respectfully submit that the pending claims are in condition for allowance. The Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the application and allowance of the pending claims.

If the Examiner determines the prompt allowance of these claims could be facilitated by a telephone conference, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at 408-987-5920.

Please direct correspondence to the address given below.

Dated: 10/31, 2007

Respectfully submitted,


Yue Li
Limited Recognition No.: L0346

Address: Murabito Hao and Barnes LLP
Two North Market Street
Third Floor
San Jose, CA 95113